

THE
CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

BY MEMBERS OF MENDON ASSOCIATION.

VOL. IV.

OCTOBER, 1827.

No. 10.

CONTENTS.

Sermon—from 1 Thess. v. 7,	289	Afflictions,	310
The Pilgrim's Progress in the		On Dancing,	310
Nineteenth Century,	296	British and Foreign Bible Society,	310
Argument of the Universalists		Aphorisms,	311
from Rev. v. 13, considered,	302	Review of Tracts published by	
Sir Matthew Hale, on Sancti-		the Am. Unitarian Association,	311
fying the Sabbath,	307	Ordinations and Installations,	320
Family Prayer,	308	Poetry,	320
Courage of the Deist,	309	To Correspondents	320
A Name above every name,			

CONDITIONS.

1. THE CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE shall contain 32 octavo pages, be executed as it respects type and paper in the style of the Christian Spectator, and afforded to subscribers at \$1.50 a volume, payable in advance; or \$2 paid at the end of six months.

2. Those who become responsible for five copies shall receive the sixth gratis.

3. No subscriptions are to be taken for less than a year; and if notice of discontinuance is not given before the issuing of the last number, subscribers will be considered as desiring it the succeeding year.

N. B. All communications to this work are to be sent, *post paid*, to the Centre Post-Office in Wrentham, Mass., directed to the Editors of the Christian Magazine, or to the office of T. R. MARVIN, Congress-street, Boston.

Boston:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY T. R. MARVIN,

FOR THE PROPRIETORS.

1827.

THE CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. IV.

OCTOBER, 1827.

No. 10.

SERMON.

1 THESS. V. 7. *They that sleep, sleep in the night.*

IN the book of Ecclesiastes we are taught, that "to every thing there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven: a time to be born, and a time to die: a time to plant, and a time to pluck up that which is planted: a time to kill, and a time to heal: a time to break down, and a time to build up. A time to weep, and a time to laugh: a time to mourn, and a time to dance: a time to cast away stones, and a time to gather stones together: a time to embrace, and a time to refrain from embracing. A time to get, and a time to lose: a time to keep, and a time to cast away: a time to rend, a time to sew: a time to keep silence, and a time to speak: a time to love, and a time to hate: a time of war, and a time of peace." In the above enumeration of times and seasons, Solomon has not mentioned *sleep*: but as he says in general that there is a time to every purpose under the heaven, we may therefore conclude, that there is a time to sleep, and a time to refrain from sleeping. It may sometimes be difficult to determine, when is the proper time to sleep: in the passage from which we have derived our text, the Apostle says, "They that sleep, sleep in the night, and they that be

drunken are drunken in the night." From this passage it would seem that when the Apostle wrote his epistle to the Thessalonians, the night was the time that temperate persons devoted to sleep, and the time that the intemperate devoted to drunkenness. But we have reason to believe that the time devoted to sleep and to drunkenness has been altered since the epistle to the Thessalonians was written: last Thursday morning while folding my paper to write this discourse, I observed a man pass my window, apparently so drunken that he could with difficulty walk, and from his appearance I concluded, that his time to be drunken was in the morning: and from what I have observed in our congregation of late, I have been afraid that a number among us had come to the conclusion, that when in the house of God on the Sabbath is the time to sleep. Viewing it of importance to direct your attention to what appears to be an existing evil, it is proposed in the present discourse,

I. To show that the sanctuary is not the place to sleep. And,

II. To illustrate the importance of guarding against this existing evil. I am

I. To show that the Sabbath is not the time nor the sanctuary the place to sleep. The Sabbath is a day of rest from secular employments; but it was

not given for our slothful indulgence of sensual appetites: the sanctuary is the place of our solemnities: here we profess to worship before the Lord our Maker, and hence in the first place,

1. To sleep in the sanctuary is inconsistent with that regard which we ought to have for ourselves. Admitting that we have no regard to the solemnities of the Sabbath and of the sanctuary; admitting that our assembling together is only a ceremony, still we ought to have sufficient respect to our own appearance to conduct the ceremonial with decency. The practice of sleeping in the house of God may become so general, that every one will feel that in doing it, there are enough to keep him in countenance: so any other act of indecorum may become so general in a community as to be considered a matter of course. But when indecorous conduct becomes so general as to be considered a matter of course, we are not to suppose that it is no longer indecorous. For it only shows that in that community the sense of propriety which ought to influence their conduct has ceased to operate. We can easily suppose that the practice of sleeping may become so general as to be extended to the whole congregation, and in that case we can have no doubt that their appearance would be in the highest degree indecent. But that which all may not do without shame, an individual cannot do without detracting from that regard which he ought to pay to his own conduct. Every person has a character to support, and we know that there are some things which no man can do without injury to himself. In the context the Apostle says, "They that be drunken, are drunken in

the night," and why does he assume, that drunkards will choose the night rather than the day for their intemperance? Because in the age in which he wrote, drunkenness was so disreputable, that even drunkards were ashamed to be known openly. But in our age, drunkenness has become so general that drunkards now brave the shame and expose their intemperance to the light of day. In the same connexion the Apostle says, "They that sleep, sleep in the night;" and the reason why he assumes this position is, because in that age in which he wrote, the practice of sleeping in their religious meetings was probably unknown. Now it has become in some measure general; but it is not the less indecent. Nor can our practice render it reputable; for no man can be in the practice of sleeping in the house of God without injury to himself: it is a crime which, although it may become so general as to be chargeable even upon good men, is revolting to the moral sense of every community. But,

2. We ought not to sleep in the house of God, because the practice directly tends to bring the preaching of the Gospel into contempt. The preached Gospel is the means by which it has pleased God to save them that believe: we may admit, that the means are not of themselves equal to the effect; that they are weak means, yea foolish: but seeing that it has pleased God in all ages to make instruments in themselves feeble, productive of the highest good, we must be allowed to contend that every practice which tends to bring those means into contempt is a crime against God and against social order. Now if whenever

the preacher has named his text, a portion of his audience shall place themselves in the most convenient position to indulge in sleep, I ask, whether their practice has not that tendency? Do they not practically say, Having attended to the prayer and to the singing, there is nothing now to be heard which is worthy our attention? And so far as their example has influence, do they not practically say to all who are awake, There is nothing now to be heard which is worth your attention? And especially will not this be the tendency, if those who indulge in sleep are the more serious and more aged part of the congregation? What hope can the preacher entertain that his discourse will gain the attention and reach the heart of the enemies of truth, while it excites not sufficient interest to guard its professed friends against sensual indulgence in sleep? I know that some plead in justification of the practice, their inability after the active labors of the week to restrain themselves. And that there is a strong tendency to sleep in those who are accustomed to labor through the week, may be readily admitted; but in view of the evil to be avoided and the good to be obtained, this very tendency ought to be only a stronger inducement to guard against indulgence. Is the practice an evil? then the tendency to that practice is an evil, and it ought to be resisted. The word of God nowhere assures us, that they will be allowed to do wrong who are strongly inclined to evil; on the contrary, it commands us to resist temptation, to overcome evil and to resist unto blood striving against sin. It will be universally admitted that were the heart engaged in the solemnities

of the sanctuary, it would not be difficult to refrain from sleep: to sleep therefore in the sanctuary only manifests the coldness of your hearts; and why should any among us give public testimony every Sabbath to their own indifference to the institutions of Christ, by which he maketh men wise unto salvation?

3. We ought not to sleep in the sanctuary, because by the indulgence of such a practice we place ourselves beyond the reach of the means of grace. We should readily admit, that those persons greatly injure themselves and their families, who withdraw from the sanctuary of God: but wherein is he different, who habituates himself to sleeping there? In the one case they place themselves beyond the reach of means, and so also do the others. Some appear to claim a right to sleep when doctrines are discussed, because they are not friendly to doctrinal preaching: others appear to claim the same privilege, when a subject that is already familiar is under consideration: and thus one sleeps because he is afraid of light, and another because he expects to hear nothing new. But, does not the existence of such a spirit among any people, destroy the hope of usefulness? The Gospel is not a novelty, neither is it mainly an appeal to the passions of mankind: it contains a system of doctrines and of truths, which have been again and again illustrated for 1800 years. To preach profitably, or to hear profitably, we must not aim at novelty to the rejection of that which is important, neither ought we to admit that there is any doctrine revealed which we can have no interest in hearing discussed. Such an assumption is inconsistent with

that child-like spirit without which we cannot enter the kingdom of God: and the very mention of such excuses for inattention to the means of grace, reveals a heart too proud to enter the kingdom of God.

4. We ought not to sleep in the sanctuary, because it is a sin against God. Sleeping in the house of God is not a disease; but a habit, and like intemperance, or any other evil habit, it gains upon us by indulgence. Now we never excuse those who by habitual indulgence find it difficult to restrain themselves from evil: for in those habits they are voluntary. And on the same principle, God will not hold him guiltless, who in the indulgence of an evil habit places himself beyond the reach of those means of grace, which he has sanctified, and who at the same time lends the force of his example to the introduction of a practice which cannot become general, without reducing the means of grace to contempt. If the magnitude of any sin may be estimated by its bearing on others, then is this practice of sleeping in the house of God, a sin of no common magnitude: for in its relations it is accompanied with many aggravating tendencies. We proceed,

II. To illustrate the importance of guarding against this existing evil. There are evils which on their first appearance strike the friends of religion and order with alarm: there are other evils so insidious that they spring up, take root and extend their influence without observation. Should some of the members of this church depart from the faith and deny the Lord that bought them, without doubt a great alarm would be excited: but it may be questioned, whether evils equally destructive

of vital religion may not take root among us without observation. Among this latter class of evils to be avoided, I am disposed to rank, the practice of sleeping in the house of God. At first view we might hardly be willing to admit, that it is an evil; we should perhaps be rather disposed to consider it an infirmity: yet if we consider the moral influence of this practice, as extending to a whole people, I know nothing that will be more effectual in exerting a deadening influence upon religion. It is not an evil which will excite alarm; in view of its existence we shall hardly be willing to admit that our faith and order are in danger; but it is an evil which so far as it prevails, will produce a moral slumber and a treacherous calm: and,

“Much more this treacherous calm I dread,
Than tempests bursting o’er my head.”

It may perhaps be said that in preaching against this practice, I regard only myself, and seek to avoid the pain of addressing those who are asleep, and so far as I am concerned, I confess to you, that it is in its influence, sufficiently chilling: but were I the only person concerned, I think I could be willing to employ my voice as an instrument to hush you to repose. In the preparation of this discourse, I think that I have had respect to your good, rather than my own feelings: it is an evil which I have long lamented, and an evil too, which I am persuaded, if not guarded against, will become general. We have already admitted that in a laboring community there exists a natural tendency to this evil: if therefore to this natural tendency there is superadded the force of example, it is easy to perceive that the practice will be likely to become general. If therefore

any one would plead the difficulty of resisting an inclination to sleep, let him reflect that probably more than half this congregation labor under the same difficulty: from a regard to propriety, or from respect to the solemnities of the sanctuary, many resist this tendency; but every one who yields, does something to weaken that sense of propriety, and to prepare the way for the general prevalence of the practice. Now I am persuaded that there is not one here who would wish to see the practice generally prevail; your sense of propriety would cause you to revolt from the idea, of a whole community assembled in the sanctuary for indulgence in sleep: and I am further persuaded that some who have given countenance by their example to this practice, have never seriously reflected upon its moral tendency: the evil so far as it prevails has crept upon us so insidiously that even those who have been mostly subjected to its influence have not perceived its tendency. Permit me, therefore, as your watchman, to sound the alarm, and to ask, for what are you assembled here? Have you come to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service? And shall this sacrifice be made, while your senses are steeped in forgetfulness? Look then at the solemnity of your meeting: look on those who will be influenced by your example: look to the cause, to your duty, to your accountability, and then say, What meanest thou, O sleeper, arise, call upon thy God, if so be that God will think upon us, that we perish not.

INFERENCES.

1st. From what has been said we may learn that to the attain-

ment of any good end, attention to things small in themselves is indispensable. Attention to small matters is found to be necessary to success in things secular, and I know not why it should not be equally essential in religious matters. A manufacturer may at a great expense provide suitable buildings and machinery: but after all his labor, he will find that ultimate success will depend on the care and attention which he bestows on small savings and on the minute parts of his establishment. You, my hearers, have at a great expense and with much labor provided a commodious building for the worship of God, and we hope that you desire to promote the cause of religion in your own community; but like the manufacturer, in order to success, you must pay more strict attention to the minute parts of your conduct. A fine meeting-house, is no higher evidence of religion in a community, than the exterior deportment is of piety in an individual. Now you know that it was the characteristic of the ancient Pharisees, that while they paid the strictest attention to external deportment, they tolerated in their hearts the most rank corruption. Hence our Saviour compared them to a sepulchre, which on the outside was beautifully painted, but within was full of all corruption. Hence therefore in order to form a judgment of the state of religion among us, we must not be satisfied with the exterior of our house of worship; for it is not the house, but the assembly, which gives the direction to character. Now we will suppose that a stranger has come among us for the purpose of forming a judgment of our religious character: his first impressions would be favorable, for

he would first regard the outward appearance; but when he came to take a nearer view, when he observed a sleepy congregation, listless and indifferent, would he not say, Ah, this people have washed the outside of the cup and the platter; but they seem to pay no attention to that which is yet more indispensably necessary to their success as a religious community. Would you be unwilling to be thus made the object of remark to a stranger? Then realize that God sees you, that he scrutinizes your conduct yet more closely than any stranger could do; and realize that you are the object of remark to one another, that you cannot sleep without being observed, that your conduct in this indulgence will exert a chilling influence on all around you, and that if you would promote the cause of religion, you must not sleep as do others, but watch and be sober.

2. From our subject we learn, that we are in danger of losing that reverential awe, which ought to be felt in our assemblies of religious worship. Under the old dispensation, many ceremonies were instituted which tended to give solemnity to religious worship: the new dispensation has abrogated those ceremonies; for the Gospel addresses itself not to our corporeal senses, but to the understanding and to the heart. Our religious worship is better fitted to enlarge the mind and to instruct the intellect than theirs; but it is not so well adapted to strike the sense and to captivate the imagination. We do not praise God on loud sounding instruments; we burn no incense; we have no holy of holies into which the high priest may enter with a thousand ceremonies; our worship is not connected with

feasting and sacrifices; we are simply called to exercise our faculties of mind, in offering unto God a rational sacrifice of our hearts. Hence, unless we can be made to think and made to feel, there is nothing in our worship to fill the mind with reverence; for it is not addressed to the eye nor to the ear, but to the understanding and to the heart. To a thinking people, to those who are disposed to reflect, we grant that there is enough in our mode of worship to solemnize every mind; for we speak of God, of eternity, of heaven and of hell: we grant that to an intellectual people there is no form of religion so powerful as the simple testimony of the Gospel: but if a people will not hear, if they will not give their hearts to receive instruction, then they are in great danger of losing all that reverence of God which ought to be felt in religious worship. Solomon says, "Keep thy foot, when thou goest to the house of God, and be more ready to hear than to give the sacrifice of fools." By the sacrifice of fools, he probably designed to reprove that admiration of show and ceremony which was doubtless one of the evils of their ceremonial worship: but with us the sacrifice of fools will not be bestowed on show and ceremony, it will rather be manifested in listless inattention and cold indifference.

3. So far as the present subject is applicable to our circumstances, we have reason to believe that the spirit and power of religion are not felt among us. The power of religion is at the furthest possible remove from sluggishness and inactivity; it pierceth the heart, it renovates the soul; if any thing in the world can make a man active, lively, and engaged,

it is the exercise of truly religious affections. Hence the Psalmist speaks of praising God with all the heart, and of worshipping God with all his strength; and in other parts of his Psalms he explains what he means by these expressions: he speaks of rising at midnight to worship God and of going up to the sanctuary with exceeding joy. Paul also in the exercise of the same spirit, speaks of being constrained by the love of Christ, and in other passages he explains his meaning by saying, that for Christ's sake he had suffered the loss of all things, and that he accounted them but dross, when compared with the excellency of his Lord. Now when we compare our own sluggish inactivity and dulness in religion with the holy energy of Paul and David, we seem to be men of a different spirit. Judging of the influence which religion has upon our own energies we may well question whether there is not an essential difference between their religion and ours. Were a person under the influence of their spirit to come among us, were he to witness our coldness and our disposition to sleep in the house of God, would he not say, that we had no religion? And if there is such ground for suspicion, is it not our duty to take up the subject and make our own case a matter of serious reflection before God?

4. If what has been said is applicable to our circumstances, then it becomes us to remove this existing evil far from us. In the spirit of meekness, I would ask you, fathers and brethren, What is to be done? We have admitted that your employment through the week, creates a tendency to sleep when in the house of God; and perhaps you will go further and say, that this tendency cannot

be resisted. And if it cannot be resisted, what then is to be done? Are our solemn meetings to be thus perverted? Is the preached Gospel to be as the sound of an instrument to hush us to repose? God has commanded us to reverence his sanctuary; and have we such a disposition to sleep that we cannot obey this command? If we cannot resist a tendency to sleep, then the command of God is unreasonable; for he has said, "Reverence my sanctuary, I am the Lord." And if we must sleep in the sanctuary, then it is clear that we cannot obey this command; for we should consider it quite disrespectful to sleep in a private circle of friends, and how can we reverence the sanctuary and yet do that which we could not do in a private circle, without a breach of good manners? The fact is, it is an idle and a pernicious habit, which ought to be resisted: it is one of those insidious evils which steals upon us at unawares: but it is not the less an evil; for unless overcome, it will carry us in a downward course, until we become a congregation of sleepers. And what then shall be done? This must depend upon yourselves, my hearers: it is for you to determine whether you shall sleep or not. Do you say, that you cannot prevent it? One thing you can do: instead of fixing upon a convenient position, you can fix upon one where it would be extremely difficult to sleep: instead of covering, you can uncover your eyes; and instead of lolling, you can stand up.

The greatest friend of truth is Time, her greatest enemy is Prejudice, and her constant companion is Humility.

From the Utica Christian Repository.

THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.—BY BUNYANUS.

CHAPTER XIX.

Love-self. It seems to me that brother Thoughtful's notions of christian character condemn every body. He would allow none to be christians but such as exercise that love which is the fulfilling of the law. But, it is written, "there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good and sinneth not."

Thoughtful. It would be of no use for us to attempt to justify those whom the great Judge condemns. And he certainly condemns all those who are destitute of holiness. Holiness is conformity to the moral law, which is the only rule of right and wrong. No man has any more holiness, than he has of conformity to the moral law.

Love-s. But what I mean is, that your scheme seems to require perfection, and to condemn all who are not perfect; and since the best of men are imperfect, it condemns the best of men as well as the worst.

Th. Uninterrupted conformity to the moral law is required of all men as a duty; but uninterrupted conformity to the moral law is not made the condition of pardon and salvation. If it were, there would be no hope for any. But, if a man is *never* conformed to that law, he *never* does any thing right, he never has the same mind that was in Christ, he never delights in the law of God after the inward man, he never walks after the Spirit, he *always* walks after the flesh, and shall die. If he never exercises that love which is the fulfilling of the law, he never possesses the temper of one that is "born of God, and

knoweth God." If he never "doeth righteousness," but always "committeth sin," he is not a child of God, but is a child of the devil. Good men are those who are sometimes conformed to the moral law, who perform some right actions, who sometimes have the same mind that was in Christ, and sometimes delight in the law of God after the inward man. But the best of men in this world are imperfect, as they are not always conformed to the moral law, and their right actions are intermingled with such as are wrong.

Love-s. Your scheme would still condemn me; for I do not think so highly of myself as to suppose I was ever conformed to the law for a single moment, or that I ever, for the smallest space of time, observed it with my whole heart. My only hope is, that my poor attempts will be accepted for the prince Immanuel's sake; and that my imperfections will be covered up with the robe of his perfect righteousness, so that the great Judge will see no spot in me. And this, I think, puts the highest honor upon him, as the sole author of my salvation.

Th. Can you expect that *sin* will be accepted by a holy being? And do you think you put honor upon the prince Immanuel, by hoping that *sin* will be accepted for his sake? What is this, but to make him the minister of sin? If your "poor attempts," as you call them, do not any of them come up to the law, they do altogether fall short of it. And if they altogether fall short of it, they are altogether sin. And it must be a vain hope, to suppose that any thing can hide your sins from the eye of the omniscient Judge, who has said he will "bring every work into judg-

ment, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." The prince Immanuel is indeed the sole author of our salvation. But it appears to me most honorable to him to suppose he accomplishes it by saving us *from* our sins, and not *in* them; and that, instead of covering up our sins, so that the eye of Omniscience cannot see them, though we continue in them, he will, by his Holy Spirit, bring us to repent of our sins and forsake them, and by his blood, procure our pardon; and that he will carry on the work by causing us "to walk in his statutes," and to "keep his judgments and do them," till "by patient continuance in *well doing*," we are fitted for "glory, and honor, and immortality."

Love-s. If you believe your own scheme, you probably think you do, sometimes, observe the moral law with your whole heart, and perform some actions which in themselves are right in the sight of God. But my scheme does not lead me to think so highly of myself. And let me give you the caution which is given by an apostle to every man, "not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think."

Th. The caution is not unnecessary for me, and I desire to observe it, in its full extent, and what is added also, "but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith." And it seems to me, that if the caution is necessary on my system, which teaches that God will accept of nothing but what comes up to his law, but abhors every thing which falls short of it, it is more necessary on your system, which teaches that he will accept of many things which altogether fall short of his law, and will cover up all that

he does not accept. If I think soberly, according to the measure of the grace which is given to me, and do not suppose that to be right in the sight of God which is really an abomination to him; if I form a just estimate of my own character, and view all my actions as God views them, and feel accordingly, I conclude I shall not transgress the apostle's precept. The angels in heaven and the spirits of the just made perfect, doubtless think that the exercises of their hearts are such as come up to the moral law; and yet, they are not chargeable with thinking more highly of themselves than they ought. A saint of old could say with truth, "With my whole heart have I sought thee;—give me understanding, and I shall keep thy law; yea, I shall observe it with my whole heart;—I entreated thy favor with my whole heart;—I cried with my whole heart;—I will keep thy precepts with my whole heart;—I will praise thee with my whole heart." And that he did not think too highly of himself in this, appears from the testimony of the great Searcher of hearts, who says of him, "My servant David, who kept my commandments, and who followed me with all his heart, to do that which is right in mine eyes." If we do not serve God with the whole heart, we do not serve him at all. When one inquired whether he might be baptized, it was answered, "if thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest." This implies, that if he did not believe with all his heart, he would have no right; the not doing it with all his heart would be the same as not doing it at all, but only making a hypocritical pretence, according to that divine declaration, "Judah hath not

turned unto me with her whole heart, but feignedly." The heart cannot be divided, and a part given to one object and a part to the contrary, at the same moment. "No man can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon." This must mean, no man can serve two masters, *at the same time*; for it is plain that he can at different times, one after the other. No man is ever conscious of both loving and hating the same object, at the same time, and in the same sense. The heart may be very quick in its changes from one object to its contrary; but in the same instant of time it is wholly on one side or the other. It is written, "He that is not with me is against me." It is also written, "The light of the body is the eye: If therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light. But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness." Nothing is here said about its being partly light and partly darkness; but it is represented as being full of one, or full of the other. It is also written, "If we love one another, God dwelleth in us, and his love is perfected in us." Also, "A good man, out of the good treasure of his heart, bringeth forth that which is good; and an evil man, out of the evil treasure of his heart, bringeth forth that which is evil: for of the abundance of the heart his mouth speaketh. If a man's heart is good, he is a good man; but if his heart is evil, he is an evil man; and not partly one and partly the other, at the same instant. When a man is renewed, the heart of stone is represented as *taken*

away, and a new heart given, which could not be the case, if the heart of stone remained, and a new principle were only implanted in some part of it. The practical error, against which we need to be cautioned, I conclude to be, that of supposing those actions to be right, and acceptable with God, which are really not right, because they do not come up to the moral law. If we felt our obligations to condemn ourselves, and to abhor ourselves, for every thing in us which does not come up to the moral law, and judged impartially of ourselves, according to that rule, we should doubtless find occasion to humble ourselves before God for very many of those things for which we now think highly of ourselves and are highly thought of by others. And instead of flattering ourselves that they will be accepted for the prince Immanuel's sake, we should expect they would be condemned and abhorred by all holy beings, and should loathe and abhor ourselves on account of them, and repent in dust and ashes.

Love-self. Why is not your scheme the same as brother Feelwell's doctrine of perfection? He thinks that many attain to perfection, and live for days, and months, and even years, without committing any sin. And I see not why you do not embrace the same opinion.

Th. I do not suppose that any live for days, and months, and years, without committing any sin. I would not venture to affirm that any mere man ever lived an hour or a minute in the uninterrupted exercise of holy affection. Every man, that has attended to the operations of his own mind, must be conscious that his thoughts follow each other with amazing rapidity;

and doubtless our affections are as rapid in their succession, and as changeable in their nature, as our thoughts are. But I conclude there are other points of difference between the views which I have exhibited and his doctrine of perfection.

Feel-well. Yes; for you would have it that we are under obligation to keep the moral law, and to be as perfect as Adam was before he fell, which I do not believe at all.

Th. What, then, is your standard of perfection, if it is not the moral law, the law under which Adam was in the garden, and under which the angels are in heaven?

F. w. It is the law of faith.

Th. Does your law of faith require less than was required of Adam before he fell, less than is required of the angels in heaven?

F. w. Yes. The author whom I most highly esteem, discoursing on this subject, says, "The Adamic law is in substance the same with the angelic law, being common to angels and men. It required that man should use to the glory of God, all the powers with which he was created. Consequently, this law, proportioned to his original powers, required that he should always think, always speak, and always act precisely right, in every point whatever. He was well able to do so. And God could not but require the service he was able to pay. But Adam fell; and his incorruptible body became corruptible: and ever since it is a clog to the soul, and hinders its operations. Consequently no man is able to perform the service which the Adamic law requires. And no man is obliged to perform it; God does not require it of any man. For

Christ is the end of the Adamic as well as the Mosaic law."

Th. Do you mean to include the *moral law*, when you speak of the Mosaic law?

F. w. Yes. To use the words of my author again, by "the Mosaic law," I mean, "the whole Mosaic dispensation; which St. Paul continually speaks of as one, though containing three parts, the political, *moral*, and ceremonial. By his death Christ put an end to both" the Adamic and the Mosaic law: "He hath abolished both the one and the other, with regard to man; and the obligation to observe either the one or the other is vanished away. Nor is any man living bound to observe the Adamic more than the Mosaic law. In the room of this, Christ hath established another, namely, the law of faith. Not every one that doeth, but every one that believeth, now receiveth righteousness in the full sense of the word, that is, he is justified, sanctified, and glorified. We are dead to the law by the body of Christ given for us; to the Adamic as well as Mosaic law. We are wholly freed therefrom by his death; that law expiring with him."

No-law. Let me interrupt you, to express my approbation. "Not every one that doeth, but every one that believeth, now receiveth righteousness, in the full sense of the word." That is just as I believe. We never *do* any righteousness; we only *receive* by faith, the finished righteousness that is wrought out for us. And we are not required to *do* any. "By the body of Christ we are dead to the Adamic as well as the Mosaic law; we are wholly freed therefrom by his death, that law expiring with him." I agree to that, most cordially; and am happy to

find that we are so well united in this fundamental article of our religion.

Th. How then are we, as the apostle says, "Not without law to God, but under the law to Christ?"

F. w. My author answers that very question. These are his words: "We are without *that* law. But it does not follow that we are without any law. For God has established another law in its place, even the law of faith."

Th. Here, then, is a fundamental and essential difference between your system and mine. I suppose the moral law to be the eternal and immutable rule of right, to which God himself is conformed in all his ways, and to which the holy angels are conformed in all they do. To this law Adam was entirely conformed while in a state of innocence. And after he fell, he was no less bound to be conformed to it than before, his sin not diminishing his obligations. And to the same law all men are bound to conform, all the time. Add they are well able to do it; for it requires no more than the constant right employment of all the powers they have, be they more or less. If the powers of men are diminished by the fall, that does not lessen their ability to keep the law; for he that has the least ability can do what he can, as well as he that has the greatest; and the law requires no more than all the heart, and all the soul, and all the strength, and all the mind. But you suppose this law to be set aside by the gospel, contrary to the express declaration of the apostle, "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law." And you suppose another law has

been substituted in its place, which you call the law of faith. What do you suppose your new law requires?

F. w. It requires love. My author says, "The whole law under which we now are, is fulfilled by love. Faith working or animated by love, is all that God now requires of man. He has substituted love in the room of angelic perfection. The foundation is faith, purifying the heart: the end love, preserving a good conscience."

Th. How does faith work by love?

F. w. God by his Holy Spirit reveals his love to me, and shows me that he has taken away my sins, saying to me, "thou art an heir of God, a joint heir with Christ." This direct witness of the Spirit I believe, which is faith. This fills my soul with joy, and makes me love him because he first loved me.

No-law. Here too I cannot withhold my approbation. This is my experience exactly.

Love-self. And it is mine too, in the substance of it. But let us not interrupt. I wish to hear a full account of brother Feewell's doctrine of perfection.

Th. Were I disposed to argue upon the points now stated, I should endeavor to show, that your statements are all wrong; that your notion of a direct witness of the Spirit is a delusion; and that believing that your sins are forgiven before you love God, is believing a lie; that justifying faith is not a belief that your sins are forgiven, but a cordial acquiescence in the gospel method of salvation; and that all the love which springs merely from God's supposed love to you, is selfish and wicked. But it is my present wish to obtain your views on the

subject of perfection. Having cast away the moral law as the rule of right, and substituted a new law requiring less, you suppose, of course, that some live up to all that is required by *that* law, do you not?

F. w. No. My author says again, "christian perfection is pure love, filling the heart and governing all the words and actions." But, "A man may be filled with pure love, and still be liable to *mistake*. A mistake in opinion may occasion a mistake in practice. Every such mistake is a transgression of the perfect law. Therefore, every such mistake, were it not for the blood of the atonement, would expose to eternal damnation. The best of men still need Christ in his priestly office, to atone for their omissions, their short comings, their mistakes in judgment and practice, and their defects of various kinds. For these are all deviations from the perfect law, and consequently need an atonement. Yet that they are not properly sins, we apprehend may appear from the words of St. Paul; 'He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law; for love is the fulfilling of the law.' Now, mistakes, and whatever infirmities necessarily flow from the corruptible state of the body, are no way contrary to love, nor therefore in the scripture sense *sin*. Not only sin properly so called, that is, a voluntary transgression of a known law, but sin improperly so called, that is, an involuntary transgression of a divine law, known or unknown, needs the atoning blood. I believe there is no such perfection in this life as excludes these involuntary transgressions;"—but "such transgressions," I do not call *sins*." "These souls dwell in a shattered body, and are so

pressed down thereby, that they cannot always exert themselves as they would, by thinking, speaking, and acting *precisely right*. For want of better bodily organs, they must, at times, think, speak, or act wrong; not indeed through a defect of *love*, but through a defect of knowledge. And while this is the case, notwithstanding that defect, and its consequences, they fulfil the law of love."

Th. I am not able to see why your statement is not self-contradictory. You say, "they fulfil the law of love," and yet speak of such "omissions, short comings, defects of various kinds, deviations from the perfect law, and even transgressions of it," as "need the atoning blood," and without it, would expose to eternal damnation."

F. w. It is the statement of a man wiser than you or I; and whatever you may think of it, I am resolved to believe it is entirely right, and perfectly consistent. And I know many, who, as my author says, "are saved in this world from all sin, from all unrighteousness; they are now in such a sense perfect as not to commit sin, and to be freed from all evil desires and evil tempers. *At all times* their souls are even and calm; their hearts are steadfast and immoveable. Their peace, flowing as a river, passeth all understanding. They rejoice evermore, pray without ceasing, and in every thing give thanks. Their souls are *continually* streaming up to God, in holy joy, prayer, and praise. This is a point of fact. And this is plain, sound, scriptural experience."

Th. Do you suppose that all christians, all who are justified by faith, have attained this perfection?

F. w. No. I suppose that when

a man attains it, he experiences, as my author says, another "change, immensely greater than that wrought when he was justified; when, after having been fully convinced of inbred sin, by a far deeper and clearer conviction, than that which he experienced before justification, and after having experienced a gradual mortification of it, he experiences a total death to sin, and an entire renewal in the love and image of God."

Th. It is now evident how widely your doctrine of perfection differs from mine. I believe that all christians in this life, are both perfect and imperfect in the same sense that any are, namely, in having some holy and some unholy affections, in rapid succession; and that the term *perfect* is, in the scriptures, applied to all christians, being synonymous with *saints*, or sanctified ones: But you believe that some who are in a justified state are perfect Christians, or sanctified ones, and others are not. I believe that no christian lives a single day, and perhaps not a single hour, or a single minute, in the uninterrupted exercise of holy affection, but you believe, that those you call sanctified, live for months and years without committing any sin, being, "at all times" in the uninterrupted exercise of perfect love. I believe that the moral law, which the angels keep, and under which Adam was placed in the garden, and which was communicated in the ten commands at Mount Sinai, is the only standard of perfection, the only rule of right and wrong, and that every man is bound to keep it without interruption: But you believe that law is taken away, and that no man is now under obligation to keep it;—but that a

new law, which requires less, is substituted in its room. I believe that no affections or actions are holy, but such as come up to the moral law; and that all those affections and actions which fall short of the moral law are sins: But you believe that your perfect ones, who live without committing any sin, are chargeable with very many "deviations" from your new and milder law, and many "transgressions" of it, which, "were it not for the blood of atonement, would expose to eternal damnation," but which, nevertheless, are not *sins*. In these points, and others connected with them, we differ totally.

Love-self. I perceive these differences plainly enough; and though I am not prepared to give my assent to all brother Feelwell's statements, I confess they are far less repugnant to my feelings than brother Thoughtful's, to which I can never assent, because they go to destroy all my hopes.

For the Christian Magazine.

ARGUMENT OF THE UNIVERSALISTS
FROM REV. V. 13, CONSIDERED.

And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, forever and ever.

AN understanding of the scriptures is of peculiar importance. If we misinterpret these, and receive from them falsehood instead of truth, they do not add to our knowledge, but to our ignorance. The more of the scriptures we have treasured up in our memories with erroneous ideas attached to them, the deeper are we

involved in spiritual darkness. The scriptures are capable of being *wrested*, and wrested too to our destruction. That is, a false, instead of a true interpretation may be given to them, and its practical effects may be destruction, instead of salvation. It becomes us to approach the scriptures as the word of God, as the Sovereign arbiter of all controversy respecting religion, as an infallible standard from which there is no appeal. We should approach them too with a supreme desire to know the truth, and a readiness to submit to all its practical results. We should ever guard against a rash and hasty judgment, especially where formidable difficulties present themselves to our minds, and patiently consider every circumstance which is essential to the acquisition of truth. The words at the head of this article are very differently interpreted by different men. Some, supposing them "to look forward to the completion of the scheme of God" on earth, view them as an unequivocal support to the doctrine of universal salvation. Dr. Chauncey and many other universalists have quoted them to prove this doctrine. We not only find them in the writings of universalists, but we often hear them repeated in conversation, as affording satisfactory evidence that all will be saved. Now if it is a fact that they do support this doctrine, we all ought to know it, and to dismiss our fears of future and eternal punishment. But if they do not, when fairly interpreted, give any ground to hope that all will be saved, it is important that this should be known, both as the means of preventing self-deception, and imposition upon others. The propriety of making them

the subject of a critical and thorough investigation will, therefore, be readily seen. My *first* observation upon this passage is, that it must be understood either in a restricted or unrestricted sense, that is, that *every creature*, means every *individual* creature of every description, or that it does *not* mean every *individual* creature. Here there can be no dispute. All will agree that when the Apostle says, "And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, forever and ever," he either means that he heard every *individual* creature of every description in heaven and on earth praising God, or he does *not* mean that he heard every *individual* creature of every description. Now the question is, which does he mean? Can we suppose that he means every *individual* creature without any exception? If so, then he heard not only intelligent creatures as mankind, but all the beasts, and birds, and insects, and reptiles, and fishes, with which the earth, the air and the sea abound, actually engaged in songs of praise to their Creator. Now can we suppose that this was a fact? No, you will answer, as he was evidently speaking of rational creatures only, it is not necessary to suppose that he meant any others. Very well, then I observe;

2. That if he was speaking of holy creatures, it is not necessary to suppose that he meant by every creature all the human race, but only every saint. Now that he was speaking of holy creatures, and those only, just

before he uttered the words before us, we need only to turn to the chapter to satisfy ourselves. We there find that he had just been speaking of the worship which Christ received in heaven, and in the passage before us he gives us an account of the worship which he received on earth. He seems at once to have had a view of the worship which was paid to Christ both in heaven and on earth. And in the description of it which he gives in this passage, he meant to inform us, not that all mankind were engaged in it, but that *every* saint or holy person, whether he were alive on the earth, or whether his body were sleeping in the dust, or whether he were among those whom the ocean had embosomed, was bearing an humble part in this interesting duty. "And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, forever and ever." As this is a description of holy worship paid to the Son of God, it is natural to understand all that is said in it as restricted to those who are *prepared* to worship him, in a holy manner. But,

3. A moment's attention to the *time*, when the song here described was sung, is sufficient to convince any candid mind that by every creature, is not meant every *individual* created being, but, every holy creature. What the apostle heard was something which *then* took place, and not something which was to take place afterwards. This was before any of the seals of the book were opened. It is what John saw and heard respecting the

character of him, who was to open the seals of the book. In proof of this, let us look one moment to the chapter in which it is recorded. "And I saw in the right hand of him that sat on the throne a book, written within and on the backside, sealed with seven seals. And I saw a strong angel proclaiming with a loud voice, Who is worthy to open the book, and to loose the seals thereof? And no man in heaven, nor in earth, neither under the earth, was able to open the book, neither to look thereon. And I wept much, because no man was found worthy to open, and to read the book, neither to look thereon. And one of the elders saith unto me, Weep not: behold the Lion of the tribe of Juda, the root of David, hath prevailed to open the book, and to loose the seven seals thereof. And I beheld, and lo, in the midst of the throne, and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the Elders, stood a Lamb as it had been slain, having seven horns, and seven eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth. And he came and took the book out of the right hand of him that sat upon the throne. And when he had taken the book, the four beasts, and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of the saints. And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation: And hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth. And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels

round about the throne, and the beasts, and the elders : and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands ; saying, with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, forever and ever. And the four beasts said, Amen. And the four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped him that liveth forever and ever." This, it will be noticed, is the view which John in vision had of heaven and of earth *before* the revelation of those future events, which in subsequent chapters he records, was made known to him. This book, which he here saw, and which none but the Lion of the tribe of Juda, the Lamb slain, or in plain language the Son of God, was found worthy or able to open, contained the revelations which were subsequently made to John. This apostle was permitted to stand by Christ, and to be made acquainted with the contents of the book, as the seals one after another were broken open. " And I saw," he says, " when the Lamb opened one of the seals ; and I heard, as it were the noise of thunder, one of the four beasts, saying, come and see. And I saw, and behold ; a white horse, and he that sat on him had a bow ; and a crown was given unto him ; and he went forth conquering, and to conquer." While John is permitted to stand by the Son of God, one seal after another is

opened, and the events which were in due time to take place, but which were before a secret to the world, were revealed under their appropriate symbols. And as they are revealed he records them, and the record of what was communicated at the opening of the seven seals, is the revelation which the apostle John has made to us. But what I desire may be particularly noticed here is, that the words under consideration are a description of the homage which was made to Christ, at the time when he appeared to open the seals of this book. This is not a vision of what is to take place in heaven, or in earth hereafter, it is a vision of what actually took place at the time when Christ made his revelation to the apostle. Every holy creature which was in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as were in the sea, and all that were in them John heard, saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power be unto him that sitteth on the throne, and to the Lamb, *at the time when the Lamb appeared to open the seals of the book*, which was during the life of this apostle. Now I say that this circumstance shows, that the language here used must be understood in a restricted sense, that is, it must be understood as spoken not of every individual of the human race, but only of every one that was holy. The apostle looked at angels in heaven, and to saints on earth, to all the saints, to those who were then alive, to those whose bodies were enclosed in the earth, and to those who had at various times perished in the sea, and saw that they were all rendering homage to the Son of God, who is the only suitable personage in the universe to disclose the secrets of futurity.

It was then a fact, as it ever has been since, that true saints honored the Son, as they honored the Father. But it was not then a fact, nor has it ever been since, that all of the human race, have believed in Christ, and paid him this supreme homage. It is evident then from the time when the event which is the subject of this vision took place, that the language in which it is recorded must be understood with the restrictions which have been mentioned. Those who attempt to prove by this passage, that all will be saved, consider it as descriptive of what will take place at the final consummation of all things. From the circumstance, that John heard every creature in heaven and in earth praising God and the Lamb, they infer that at the completion of his scheme on earth, to which they suppose this refers, all mankind will be made holy, and consequently happy. They suppose that this passage is descriptive of the happy state of things, which will then take place. But if they will only examine this subject thoroughly, they will perceive that whatever these words imply, they had their fulfillment in the days of the apostle John. And if all mankind were not then holy and happy, it cannot be inferred from this passage that they ever will be. As an important revelation of future events was about to be made to John, a revelation of events which deeply concerned him, and the whole church, as well as the world, it was proper that both he and they should know the character of him who was to make this revelation. Accordingly, at the moment when the Lion of the tribe of Juda, comes forward to break the seals of the book of providence, the

apostle is shown, that he is a personage whom all holy beings both in heaven and in earth worship. "And when he had taken the book, the four beasts, and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb—and they sung a new song, saying, Worthy is the Lamb to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne and to the Lamb, forever and ever." It must, therefore, appear to my readers, as it does to me, not a little astonishing, that this passage which is clearly descriptive of an event which took place at the very opening of the revelations of the apostle John, should be applied to the final consummation of all things: or that what is said of a period when the greater part of mankind are known to have been enemies of Christ, should be interpreted to show that they will all eventually celebrate his praise. Only consider this passage, as descriptive of holy beings both in heaven, and on the earth, and the worship which they as one great community did from the beginning and have ever since rendered him, and every thing pertaining to it appears perfectly natural and easy to be understood. But to make it descriptive of every individual of the human race hereafter, is not only to give it an interpretation which is contrary to a plain matter of fact, but which is attended with *other* insuperable difficulties.

[To be continued.]

SIR MATTHEW HALE ON SANCTIFYING
THE SABBATH.

To the Editor of the *Christian Observer*.

HAVING observed that you sometimes admit into your miscellany such portions of scarce or unpublished works as may promote its excellent design, I take the liberty to communicate an extract from a letter of Sir Mathew Hale to his grand-children, which has never been printed, but lies deposited, I believe, unknown to the former editors of his works, in the British Museum. If I have not formed too high an estimate of the authority of that truly wise and pious man, his testimony to the good effects resulting from a strict observance of the Christian Sabbath will prove not unacceptable to you and your readers. Should you, from this specimen, feel any wish to peruse the remainder of the letter, I shall be most happy to leave my transcript of it with your publisher. I cannot conclude this without expressing my humblest and most heartfelt thankfulness for the benefits I have derived from your labors.

G. W.

"I will acquaint you with a truth, that above forty years' experience and strict observation of myself hath assuredly taught me. I have been near fifty years a man as much conversant in business, and that of moment and importance, as most men; and I will assure you, I was never under any inclination to fanaticism, enthusiasm, or superstition.

"In all this time, I have most industriously observed, in myself and my concerns, these three things:—1. Whenever I have undertaken any secular business on the Lord's day (which was not absolutely and indispensably necessary,) that business never pros-

pered and succeeded well with me.

"Nay, if I had set myself that day but to forecast or design any temporal business, to be done or performed afterwards, though such forecast were just and honest in themselves, and had as fair a prospect as could be effected, yet I have been always disappointed in the effecting of it, or in the success of it. So that it grew almost proverbial with me, when any importuned me to any secular business that day, to answer them, that if they suspected it to succeed amiss, then they might desire my undertaking of it upon that day. And this was so certain an observation of me, that I feared to think of any secular business that day, because the resolution then taken would be disappointed or unsuccessful.

"That always, the more closely I applied myself to the duties of the Lord's-day, the more happy and successful were my business and employments of the week following. So that I could, from the loose or strict observance of that day, take a just prospect and true calculation of my temporal successes in the ensuing week.

"Though my hands and mind have been as full of secular business, both before and since I was a judge, as it may be any man's in England, yet I never wanted time in my six days to ripen and fit myself for the business and employments I had to do, though I borrowed not one minute from the Lord's-day to prepare for it, by study or otherwise. But on the other hand, if I had at any time borrowed from this day any time for my secular employments, I found it did further me less than if I had let it alone; and therefore, when some year's experience, upon a most attentive and

vigilant observation, had given me this instruction, I grew peremptorily resolved never in this kind to make a breach upon the Lord's-day, which I have now strictly observed for above 30 years.—This relation is most certainly and experimentally true, and hath been declared by me to hundreds of persons, as I now declare it to you."

From the Tract Magazine.

FAMILY PRAYER.

A pious tradesman conversing with a minister on family worship, related the following instructive circumstance respecting himself.

"When I first began business for myself, I was determined, through grace, to be particularly conscientious with respect to family prayer. Accordingly, I persevered, for many years in the delightful practice of domestic worship. Morning and evening, every individual of my family was ordered always to be present; nor would I allow my apprentices to be absent on any account. In a few years the advantages of these engagements appeared manifestly conspicuous: the blessings of the upper and the nether springs followed me—health and happiness in my family, and prosperity in my business. At length such was my rapid increase in trade, and the necessity of devoting every possible moment to my customers, that I began to think whether family prayer did not occupy too much of our time in the morning. Pious scruples arose respecting my intention of relinquishing this part of my duty; but, at length, worldly interests prevailed so far as to induce me to excuse the attendance of my apprentices; and not

long after, it was deemed advisable, for the more eager prosecution of our business, to make a prayer with my wife, when we arose in the morning, suffice for the day. Notwithstanding the repeated checks of conscience that followed this base omission, the calls of a flourishing concern, and the prospect of an increasing family, appeared so imperious and commanding, that I found an easy excuse for this fatal evil, especially as I did not omit prayer altogether. My conscience was now almost seared as with a hot iron; when it pleased the Lord to awaken me by a singular providence.

"One day I received a letter from a young man who had formerly been my apprentice, previous to my omitting family prayer. Not doubting but I continued domestic worship, his letter was chiefly on this subject. It was couched in the most affectionate and respectful terms; but judge of my surprise and confusion, when I read these words: 'Oh, my dear master, never, never shall I be able sufficiently to thank you for the precious privilege with which you indulged me in your family devotions: Oh, sir, eternity will be too short to praise my God for what I learnt there. It was there I first beheld my lost and wretched state as a sinner; it was there that I first knew the way of salvation; and there that I first experienced the preciousness of "Christ in me the hope of glory." Oh, sir! permit me to say, never, never neglect those precious engagements; you have yet a family and more apprentices: may your house be the birth-place of their souls.'—I could read no further; every line flashed condemnation in my face—I trembled—I shuddered—I

was alarmed at the thought, that the blood of my children and apprentices might soon be demanded at my hands!

"Filled with confusion, and bathed in tears, I fled for refuge in secret—I spread the letter before God—I agonized in prayer to him—but you can better conceive than I can describe my feelings; suffice it to say, that light broke in upon my disconsolate soul, and I obtained a sweet sense that there was mercy and pardon, even for such a wretch as I. I immediately drew my family around me, presented them before the Lord, and from that day to the present, I have never dared to omit family prayer. I am determined, through grace, that, whenever business becomes too large to permit family prayer, I will give up the superfluous part of my business, and retain my devotion. Better to lose a few shillings than become the deliberate murderer of my family, and the instrument of ruin to my own soul."

Extract from Abbot's Life.

COURAGE OF THE DEIST.

"It may *not* be amiss here to relate a narrative that I heard from a pious woman, concerning her brother. He was a young man that had openly and publicly professed deistical principles, asserting that there was no place of future punishment, or in other words, no hell. His conduct corresponded with his principles, and being possessed of a very handsome estate, he soon wasted his constitution by intemperance: finding it decaying very fast, he was advised to try the sea, in order to repair it again.—Accordingly, he took a passage with an old presbyterian captain, that

kept up prayer on board, and with whom he often disputed the point, asserting that he firmly believed there was no hell, or place of future punishment. However, they had not been long at sea, before the Lord sent down a mighty tempest, as he did on Jonah: all human probability of surviving was taken away; the captain perceiving their imminent danger, began to exhort them to prepare to meet God, when to his great surprise, the first man that bawled out, was Mr. *No Heller*. The captain being a steady, firm man, turned to him, and said, What is the matter with you? I hope you are not afraid to die? I thought you told me that you verily believed there was *no hell*. Oh! said he, all bathed in tears, and wringing his hands, it will do well enough to talk about on land, but it will not do for a storm at sea! However, it pleased God to spare them, and to bring them all safe home again; and he, finding his health a little recovered, began to be ashamed of his testimony at sea, and soon fell into his former excesses again, which brought on his old complaints. He was reduced to a sick bed, and all hopes being gone, as to his recovery; he began to seek God in earnest, and the Lord in his infinite mercy spoke peace to his soul. He continued happy in his love, exhorting them that came in his way against all such diabolical principles. He departed this life in a transport of joy, and, I trust, rests where the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary shall for ever be at rest."

A NAME ABOVE EVERY NAME.

WHEN the pious Bishop Beveridge was on his death bed, he did not

know any of his friends or connexions. A minister, with whom he had been well acquainted, visited him; and when conducted into his room he said, "Bishop Beveridge, do you know me?" "Who are you?" said the Bishop. Being told who the minister was, he said that he did not know him. Another friend came who had been equally well known, and accosted him in a similar manner—"Do you know *me*, Bishop Beveridge?" "Who are you," said he. Being told it was one of his intimate friends, he said, he did not know him. His *wife* then came to his bed-side, and asked him if he knew *her*. "Who are you?" said he. Being told she was his wife, he said he did not know *her*. "Well," said one, "Bishop Beveridge, do you know the Lord Jesus Christ?" "JESUS CHRIST," said he, reviving, as if the name had upon him the influence of a charm, "O! yes, I have known Him these forty years. Precious Saviour! HE IS MY ONLY HOPE!"

AFFLICTIONS.

Afflictions sent by Providence, melt the constancy of the noble mind, but confirm the obduracy of the vile. The same furnace that hardens clay, liquifies gold; and in the strong manifestations of divine power, Pharaoh found his punishment, but David his pardon.

From the Christian Observer.
ON DANCING.

ONE point remains, and I have done. Sorry I am to observe, that there are arising many gradations in the religious world; the result of a sort of fashion in

religion. There are many, who, without being real Christians, wish to be thought so. Now many of these people indulge in companies and societies, in a style of living, and in plans of education for their children, which appear to be rather inconsistent with their profession. Such characters are very apt to shelter themselves, whenever it is possible, under the example of those who are considered as more religious than themselves. The children of such persons, in all probability, learn to dance; and if any question be made of its propriety, most readily they immediately quote the example of those, whose high character may exempt them from every suspicion of insincerity. Perhaps they may be persons who stand in the very first rank in the religious world, and whose piety it would be impossible to doubt. The argument would be deemed unanswerable; but what a difference there may be in the application? With one party, the accomplishment may prove really innocent; but what may it not prove with the other? It would be very easy to enlarge on this remark; but I trust the conclusion will be obvious to your readers.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY.

THE number of languages in which the Holy Scriptures have been published by the British and Foreign Bible Society, or through its instrumentality, is now ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY-SEVEN: in *fifty-six* of which they had never been printed before. The total amount of issues in the British Isles, is 4,303,395 copies; and in other countries, sufficient to raise the

number to MORE THAN FIVE MILLIONS. The total amount of expenditures in carrying forward the various purposes of the society is SIX MILLIONS, THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-TWO THOUSAND, FIVE HUNDRED AND SIXTY DOLLARS. Yet after all these efforts, it is stated that the demand upon its services is rather increased than diminished!

APHORISMS.

The firmest friendships have been formed in mutual adversity,

as iron is most strongly united by the fiercest flame.

Let those who would affect singularity with success, first determine to be very virtuous, and they will be sure to be very singular.

Good nature is more agreeable in conversation than wit, gives a certain air to the countenance which is more amiable than beauty. It shews virtue in the fairest light, takes off in some measure from the deformity of vice, and makes even folly and impertinence supportable.

Review.

For the Christian Magazine.

REVIEW OF TRACTS published by the *American Unitarian Association*.

[Concluded from page 288.]

THE tenth Tract in the series is entitled, "Remarks on a Popular Error respecting the Lord's Supper, by F. W. P. Greenwood." The error remarked upon, is substantially this—persons consider themselves in a measure free from the obligations of religion, until by an open profession of it, and by partaking of the Lord's Supper, these obligations are voluntarily assumed. Consequently all who wish for the present to be unembarrassed with obligations of this nature, the mirthful, the fashionable, the worldly, and the scrupulous, very wisely, as they judge, conclude to defer a profession of their faith.

The error here spoken of (for an error undoubtedly it is) we think not uncommon, perhaps in every religious denomination. Persons

seem to regard communion at the Lord's table, and the other duties which stand connected with it, as a kind of free will offering, which they may make, or not, as they think good. If they consent by an open profession, they are bound; but if not, they are not bound. The consequence is, that very many live quite easy in a neglect of the most important duties—in a life of irreligion if not immorality, on the ground that they have never taken upon themselves the obligations of Christians.

Mr. G. refutes this error very properly and successfully, by showing that our religious obligations are not of a nature to be taken up and laid aside at pleasure. They were imposed upon us at the commencement of our moral existence by the Author of our being. They are the result of the most necessary relations subsisting between ourselves and him. They bind "with the ada-

mantine strength of condition and necessity."

"It would be as proper," says he, "for a son to declare that he would not fulfil every filial obligation to his parents, till he appeared in court and took a legal oath that he would do so, as for the native of a christian land to declare that there were duties to his Maker which he did not intend, nor was he required to discharge, till he had openly allowed them; and the son, after having taken such an oath, might talk as consistently about his *new* obligations, as might the Christian, after the promise was passed, about his. They were both of them born with obligations, which neither of them can dismiss nor change; they might as well dismiss the air which they inhaled with their first breath, and throw off the atmosphere which envelopes the world."

But if a profession of religion brings with it no new duties, then what advantage hath it? What are its benefits? And why may it not, as a useless formality, be laid aside? To these questions, a very satisfactory answer may be given, though none is given in the Tract. The benefit of a profession of religion is, not that it imposes new duties—duties which were not previously binding, but that it furnishes additional *inducements* to the faithful performance of duty. It increases, in a sense, our *obligations* to be faithful; since, to all previous obligation, it superadds that arising from our own voluntary recognition and engagement. This benefit of a religious profession, and of stated communion at the Lord's table, is very obvious and great, and is one of which every considerate Christian will wish to avail himself. Sensible of his own exposure and weakness, he will wish to furnish himself with every inducement—to arm himself with all possible resolution, to be devoted and faithful in the service of that Being whom he supremely loves.

The subject of this Tract is

interesting and important, and we are not certain that our sentiments differ at all from those of Mr. G. respecting it; though doubtless we might have expressed them in somewhat different language. Were the subject enlarged, so as to include the *terms* of communion—what does, and what does not, *disqualify* for a proper partaking of the holy supper, we can foresee, from what is here incidentally dropped, that our regions of thought might be wide asunder. For instance, in addressing those who "like to be gay, gay in spirit, and gay in external appearance; who are passionately fond of dancing; who delight in going to splendid entertainments, and in splendidly entertaining their friends in return;" Mr. G. "presumes not to say that the way of life which they love is not innocent," or that it unfits them for communion with Christ at his table. (p. 7.) We think we *should* presume to ask persons of this description, whether they had ever read such scriptures as these, "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world; if any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him." "Be not conformed to this evil world, but be ye transformed by the renewing of your minds." "The friendship of the world is enmity with God; whosoever therefore will be a friend of this world is the enemy of God." "Walk circumspectly, not as fools, but as wise, redeeming the time, because the days are evil." "Abstain from all appearance of evil." "Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth, and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thine heart, and in the sight of thine eyes; but know thou, that for all these things God

will bring thee into judgment."* We might presume to inquire of them, whether they were not "lovers of pleasure, more than lovers of God," and whether they must not experience an entire change of moral feeling, before they were prepared for communion with Christ, in private or in public, in this world or the future.

But notwithstanding some exceptions, we regard this Tract as a very respectable publication. It is short, but full, coming directly to the subject of which it treats, and disposing of it in as few words as possible. The style, if not the most forcible, is neat and perspicuous, and the whole is fitted to leave a favorable impression. We should gladly see it in the hands of many in our congregations, who are quietly neglecting important religious duties, on the mere ground that they have not *covenanted* to perform them;—just as though God had left it for us to say, not whether we should serve him or no, but whether we should be under *moral obligation* to serve him—whether we could neglect his service, and be guiltless.

We have now gone through with those Tracts, the titles of which were announced at the commencement of this Review. Since writing our first number, another Tract has made its appearance, to which, in conclusion, the attention of our readers is solicited. Its title is "Unitarianism vindicated against the charge of not going far enough." Says the writer in his first sentence, "When all other objections to Unitarianism fail, it is common for opponents to say, that this system is very well as far as it goes, but it

does not go far enough." "When all other objections to Unitarianism fail;"—there are other objections then, besides the one here under consideration. But says this same writer, in his last sentence, "Thus do we answer the objection, that Unitarians do not go far enough; and, as this objection virtually includes *every other*," &c. This objection is here made to include *every other*; and consequently there can be no objection to Unitarianism separate from this.—Before the Tract goes to another edition, we hope the writer will bring his first and last sentences together, and inform us which of them he would have us believe. For ourselves, we really think there may be other objections, besides the one which he has undertaken to refute. We think Unitarianism may lie open to the charge, not only of "not going far enough," but of not being "very well as far as it goes;" so that if our author succeeds in removing the former objection, the latter may still remain, and the controversy may not be at an end.

In his attempts to vindicate his religious system "against the charge of not going far enough," the writer undertakes to prove, "that it goes far enough for *scripture*; far enough for *safety*; and far enough for *moral effect*." It goes far enough for scripture, he says, in the views it inculcates "of the *person* and *authority* of Jesus Christ; of the *honor* due to him; and of the *reconciliation* or *atonement* he has effected." (p. 4.) But in his endeavors to show this, by comparing his system, in its bearing on these great and interesting subjects, with that inculcated in the scriptures, the scriptures are very unfairly treated. They are not fully or impartially

* 1 John, ii. 15. Rom. xii. 2. James, iv. 4. Eph. v. 15. 1 Thes. v. 22. Ec. xi. 9.

consulted, and consequently are made to hold forth a sentiment, which they never were intended to convey. A class of passages is introduced, which, taken separately, may seem to favor Unitarian views, to the total neglect of another class, with which these should be compared, and by which they should be qualified; and then, without ceremony, the conclusion is drawn, that Unitarianism goes as far as the scriptures, and is, in fact, the religion of the Bible. But this is not treating the subject fairly. This is not fearlessly walking with the Unitarian doctrine through the whole length and breadth of scripture, to see whether they agree or not. We know there are passages, those for instance which speak of Christ as inferior to the Father and dependent on him, which are equally consistent with the views of Trinitarians and Unitarians respecting his person: For Trinitarians believe that Christ was, in a sense, inferior to the Father, and dependent on him. But in determining whether Unitarianism goes as far as the scriptures, there are other passages to be taken into the account. Christ is spoken of in the scriptures as "JEHOVAH our righteousness." He is spoken of as "the MIGHTY God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of peace." He "is GOD OVER ALL blessed forever." He "is the TRUE GOD and everlasting life." Saith the Father to the Son, "thy throne, O GOD, is forever and ever; the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre." "*By him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him, and for him; and he is be-*

fore all things, and by him all things consist."* No one can doubt that these and similar passages are in the Bible, and that they are the actual representation of the Bible, in regard to the personal glory of the Saviour. Unitarians can determine for themselves, whether their scheme carries them as far as this. If it does, it carries them, on this point, far enough for scripture; if not, it is fearfully, infinitely deficient.

There are passages, relating to some of the duties which we owe to the Father, which harmonize equally with the views of Trinitarians and Unitarians; since we all agree that the Father is a proper object of religious worship, and the person to be more commonly addressed in prayer. But there are other passages, in which the *Son* is unequivocally represented as entitled to the worship of his saints. He was often worshipped during his abode on earth, and under circumstances which forbid the idea that a mere civil obeisance was intended. Stephen died upon his knees, while in the act of praying to his Saviour. Nearly all the epistles of Paul conclude with an ejaculatory prayer to the Lord Jesus. But to put the question of his title to religious worship beyond all dispute, the heavens were opened to the beloved John, and he heard the whole celestial choir offering their praises and adorations to the Son of God. He saw "the four beasts, and the four and twenty elders, fall down before the *Lamb*, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odors, which are the *prayers of saints*." He heard "ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands,

* Jer. xxiii. 6. Isa. ix. 6. Rom. ix. 5. 1 John, v. 20. Heb. i. 3. Col. i. 16.

saying with a loud voice, *Worthy is the Lamb that was slain.*" He heard every creature, in heaven and on earth, saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth on the throne, and to the *Lamb*, forever and ever." (See Rev. v. 8—13.) The scriptures then *do warrant* the offering of religious worship to the Saviour. Does Unitarianism warrant the same? If so, it goes as far, on this subject, as the scriptures. But if not, it falls infinitely short of the scriptures, in the honors which it ascribes to the Son of God.

We could better tell whether Unitarianism goes as far as the scriptures, in the views it inculcates respecting the death of Christ, if we knew precisely what these views were. "We look upon the death of Christ," says the writer of the Tract, "as the means by which he was made perfect; as affording a signal attestation to his sincerity; and as important and necessary for *other moral uses.*" (p. 7.) But for *what other moral uses*, we are not informed. "We believe," says he on one page, "that this voluntary sacrifice of Christ may have had a *direct influence on God in favor of mankind.*" (p. 7.) But in contradiction to this, we are told on the next page, that "the sufferings of Christ are part of the means of reconciling us to God, but *not of reconciling God to us.*" (p. 8.) Amidst all this uncertainty and contradiction, it is easy to see, however, that the great object of Christ's death, as set forth in the scriptures, is kept entirely out of sight. There is nothing said of his being "wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities"—of his making his life a ransom, a propitiation, a sacrifice for sinners—

or of his "bearing our sins in his own body on the tree." There is nothing said of his "giving himself for our sins"—"suffering for our sins"—"purging our sins"—"dying for our sins"—or shedding his blood "for the remission of sins." Accordingly there is nothing said, of our being "forgiven for Christ's sake," of our being "justified by his blood," "purchased with his blood," "redeemed by his blood," and "washed from our sins in his own blood."—There is no uncertainty or contradiction in the scriptures, respecting the great object of the Saviour's death. He died to make atonement for the sins of men. He died to open a way, in which "God could be just, and yet the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus." He died to lay a strong foundation, on which pardon could be freely dispensed to penitent, returning sinners. This is clearly the view, which Isaiah, and Paul, and Peter, and John, and which indeed Christ himself entertained, respecting the leading object of his death. Do Unitarians entertain the same? If so, they go as far as the scriptures on this fundamental subject. If not, they are chargeable with a deficiency, for which nothing can compensate.

We cordially unite with the writer of this Tract in saying, "To the law, and to the testimony." We hold the scriptures to be an authority, from which there is no appeal, and the standard by which all our speculations are to be tried. But let those who thus confidently appeal to the scriptures be willing to travel through the scriptures, and measure their system by the whole length and breadth of this unerring rule.—In view of the remarks which have been made,

we leave it to the decision of all impartial readers—we could almost leave it to Unitarians themselves—whether their scheme does not fall fearfully short of this rule, even in those points, on which they have themselves chosen that the comparison should be made. The scriptures represent the Lord Jesus Christ as “God,” “the mighty God,” “the true God,” the “God over all;” but Unitarianism represents him as something infinitely less. The scriptures represent him as a proper object of religious worship, and as actually receiving the solemn worship of saints on earth, and of glorified beings in heaven; but Unitarianism denies him this worship. The scriptures represent him as laying the only foundation in his blood, for the pardon of penitent, returning sinners. “Other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.” But Unitarians say, they “would resort to the less chilling creed of the Atheist, rather than admit” the doctrine of atonement by the blood of Christ. These, it will be recollected, are the three points, in relation to which the writer of the Tract proposes to show, that Unitarianism goes as far as the scriptures. But who, that has any tolerable acquaintance with the scriptures, can avoid seeing that he has utterly failed? Unitarianism and the Scriptures! There is such a palpable discrepancy between them—such a defection, a falling off, of the former from the latter, that if the one is true, the other cannot be! If the one is a revelation from God, the other, in all its distinguishing features, is clearly an invention of the world!

Our author's second attempt is to show that “Unitarianism

goes far enough *for safety*.” Under this head, he has various wise remarks respecting the comparative danger of believing too much, and too little; and respecting the comparative guilt of refusing divine honors to the Saviour, on supposition he is God, and of worshipping him, on supposition he is not. He considers the conduct of those (if those there be) who pretend to be Calvinists, because, on Unitarian principles, the Calvinist may be saved, while, on Calvinistic principles, the Unitarian cannot be saved; and he endeavors to allay the fears of some, who think “the tendency of making any retrenchments on the popular faith, is to downright infidelity.”

We design not to follow him, in his remarks on these subjects, not because they contain nothing objectionable, or what it might be difficult to refute; but because we think them of very little consequence, especially in their bearing on the point in question. The point to be proved is, that “Unitarianism goes far enough *for safety* ;” or that the *soul of the Unitarian is safe*. But who does not see, that this proposition rests entirely upon the one already discussed? What do we know of the terms of salvation, or the qualifications for heaven, any farther than these are disclosed in the scriptures? If “Unitarianism goes far enough for scripture,” then doubtless it “goes far enough for safety.” But if it falls essentially short of the scriptures, no person should be induced to rest his soul upon it. Hence, we are thrown directly back upon the ground of scripture—the ground over which we have already passed. And we do think we have shown—incontestably shown—that Unitarianism falls

short of the religion of the Bible, in the most essential particulars. It makes *us*, in our natural state, very different beings from what the Bible represents us. It proposes a Saviour infinitely inferior to the one exhibited in the scriptures. It forbids that worship, which inspired men of old, and which saints and angels in heaven, have felt constrained to offer to the Son of God. But, above all, it takes away the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ—the only foundation of hope to the ruined sinner, directing him to seek forgiveness in some other way, than through the atoning blood of Jesus. A system so essentially defective, as well as erroneous, and coming so fearfully short of the Bible; how can it be safe? Denying the native guilt and ruin of man, his need of an almighty Saviour, and the fact that such a Saviour has appeared, and shed his blood for the remission of sins; how can it be safe? We judge not those who have embraced this system. We hope they may be better, in some instances, than a consistent adherence to their avowed principles would render them. But how can we think them renewed in the temper of their minds, when they deny that such a change is ordinarily needed or experienced? How can we think them washed in the blood of Christ, when they do not feel that they are naturally polluted, and do not believe that the blood of Christ was shed, or is ever applied, for the cleansing of the soul? We do not judge them; but if any of this class are in a safe condition for eternity, it must be, not because their system is safe, but because their characters have been formed under the influence of a better system. If any of them are pious, their piety

must be sustained, not by the principles which they have embraced, but in spite of them.

The writer of the Tract endeavors to show, in the third and last place, that "Unitarianism goes far enough for *moral effect*." In urging this, he admits, that the faith of the Unitarian "has fewer objects" than that of the Calvinist; but he supposes that these few embrace all those great principles, which are of any considerable practical power. But here again we must be allowed to think differently. As it seems to us, it is those great doctrines of religion which the Unitarian rejects, which give to the Bible its amazing power—which render it "like the fire and hammer, which break the rock in pieces." The doctrine of total depravity, clearly stated and closely urged, is that which awakens the slumbering conscience, and revives an affecting sense of sin. The doctrines of Christ's divinity, incarnation, and atoning blood, though "to the Jews a stumbling block, and to the Greeks foolishness"—though rejected and despised by the "reasoning pride" of man—are still, in a pre-eminent degree, "the power of God, and the wisdom of God." It is because our divine Saviour was "in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross"—it is because we regard him in this light, that we feel the influence of his bleeding love, constraining us to love him, follow him, and devote ourselves to him—constraining us to "live no

longer unto ourselves, but to him who died for us, and rose again." The doctrine of justification by faith alone, is fitted to abase our pride, to remove all ground of self-confidence and boasting, and brings us to a sole and simple reliance upon the sufficiency of our Saviour. And to particularize no farther; the future and eternal punishment of the wicked is a doctrine of great power, alarming the fears of the careless and profane, and exciting them to flee from the wrath to come. Take away these and the kindred doctrines, which the Unitarian rejects, and the Bible is, in a manner, neutralized. Its edge is blunted; its solemn interest has departed; its renovating power is gone. It no longer pricks the sinner to the heart; stops him in his career of guilt; and induces the agonizing cry, "Men and brethren, what shall I do?" Bereft of those doctrines which have been mentioned, the Gospel (if it be not a misnomer to call it Gospel) becomes cold and powerless, fitted rather to quiet the conscience than to arouse it, and to satisfy men with a worldly decency of external behaviour, in place of the warm and vigorous devotion of the heart.

These conclusions, formed *a priori*, are abundantly justified by facts. The decisions of Dr. Priestly, as to the superior religious character of Orthodox believers generally, and of Dr. Chalmers, as to the comparative efficacy of Orthodox and Unitarian preaching, as verified in his own experience, have been given in the preceding pages, (see pp. 158 and 250.) It is admitted also in the Tract before us, as "a remark often made," that "the characters formed under Trinitarian impressions are more strict,

serious, and devout, than those formed under Unitarian impressions." (p. 22.)

The writer of this Tract observes that "in many characters, formed under Calvinistic impressions, there is a certain severity and extravagance, from which every one must wish them free. This remark he applies particularly to Orthodox females, comparing them to Queen Mary, of whom it was said, "that she was a good tempered lady, of an ill tempered religion."—If we understand this comparison, intended doubtless as a compliment for our Orthodox sisters, and which it cost the author apparently no little trouble to present, the meaning is this, "They are very good tempered, but their religion is ill tempered. Consequently *they are better than their religion.*" But if this is his meaning, he may rest assured, that Orthodox females can receive no such compliment from him. They good tempered, but their religion ill tempered! They better than their religion! The idea will shock them, and fill them with horror! It is their daily lamentation before God in secret, that they come so far short of their holy religion, in strictness, in purity, in devotedness, in every thing. Their religion is to them the high standard of perfection, comprizing all that is "fair, and lovely, and of good report;" and while they know that they are very far from having yet attained, or from being already perfect, like the great Apostle, they "forget those things which are behind, and reach forth unto those which are before, and press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."

We conclude this review, which has been protracted far beyond

the limits originally prescribed, with two general remarks; the first relating to the manner in which it has been conducted; and the second, to the importance of the questions at issue between us.—We offer no apology for what we have written, on the ground of its having been prepared in haste, and amidst almost numberless interruptions; for, though an apology of this nature could never be made probably with more justice, with intelligent readers it would not, and we soberly think should not, excuse palpable failures, in point of execution.—In remarking upon the publications which have been before us, we have practised nothing like disguise or reserve. We have expressed our sentiments with frankness and confidence, feeling strongly supported by the scriptures, and by a consciousness of the goodness of our cause. We have spoken always plainly, and sometimes, it will be thought perhaps, unguardedly; but have not intended to treat our Unitarian neighbors with undue severity, or their publications with unfairness. We have freely awarded commendation, where we felt that it was due, and have as freely controverted and even censured, where truth and a good conscience seemed to require it.

The questions at issue between us and Unitarians are certainly of very great and solemn moment. Unlike some which are agitated on the subject of religion, these take hold upon the essentials of

the Gospel—upon the vital interests of the soul. They respect the Supreme Being, the great object of love, of worship, of confidence, of joy, to all dutiful creatures throughout the universe. They respect the natural character and condition of man, and his necessity of a radical change in his moral affections, in order to see the kingdom of God. They respect the personal dignity and glory of the Saviour; the object for which he came into the world; and the nature of the work which he here accomplished. They respect the foundation of the sinner's hope, the one party laying it in the atoning blood of Christ, and the other in the merits of the creature, or in the unsatisfied mercy of the Creator. They reach even to the future world, and respect the degree and duration of that fearful punishment which awaits the wicked beyond the grave. If questions such as these are trifles, all religion must be a trifle. The immortal soul, on this ground, is a trifle, and salvation and damnation are words without meaning. Let all then feel, when they reflect on this controversy, that it is a great one, a solemn one, one in which each for himself has a deep, an awful, a personal concern. And let all those consider, who are called in providence to take a stand respecting it one way or the other, that their determination involves interests lasting as eternity, and precious as the undying soul.

Ordinations and Installations.

Aug. 22.—Rev. J. H. MARTIN was ordained at Hanover, Ms. as an Evangelist, by Plymouth North Association. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Colburn, of Abington.

Sept. 6.—Mr. AMASA CLARK, was ordained as an Evangelist, in Russell, Ms. by the Westfield Baptist Association.

Sept. 6.—Rev. JOHN T. BALDWIN, was ordained as an Evangelist, at Springville, N. Y. by the Presbytery of Buffalo.

Sept. 12.—Rev. GEORGE COWLES was installed Pastor of the Second Congregational Church and Society in Danvers, Ms. Sermon by Rev. Dr. Woods of Andover.

Sept. 12.—Rev. JARED CURTIS, Chaplain of the State Prison at Auburn, N. Y. was ordained as an Evangelist, at Stockbridge, Ms. in compliance with the wishes of the Managers of the Prison Discipline Society. Sermon by Rev. D. D. Field.

Poetry.

From a London Magazine.

A BROTHER BORN TO ADVERSITY.

WHEN ev'ry scene, this side the grave,
Seems dark and cheerless to the eye,
How sweet at such an hour to have
A brother in adversity!

When father, mother, all are gone,—
When bursts affection's closest tie,—
How sweet to claim, as still our own,
A brother in adversity!

When frowns an angry world unkind,
And hope's delusive visions fly,
How sweet in such an hour to find
A brother in adversity!

And who is this whom still we find,
When father, mother, husband, die,
Still faithful, tender, loving, kind?
A brother in adversity!

Jesus! my Lord! ah, who can trace
Thy love unchanging, full, and free;
Or tell the riches of thy grace,
Thou brother in adversity!

Ye trav'lers in this wilderness,
Who somewhat of his beauty see:
Forever, oh! forever bless
This brother in adversity!

ANON.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

"Juvenis" is received, and "F. C. R.," upon the subject of submission. As we consider the leading principles in relation to this subject already sufficiently discussed in our work, and as we have inserted two pieces on each side of the question, we think it best to decline the insertion of any thing further upon the subject for the present. Two pieces on each side of a controversy, are as many as can, generally, be admitted. We wish it to be understood, that our work is open to controversy, and that we shall indulge our correspondents to as great an extent as, in our judgment, will be admissible.

The Christian Almanac for 1828.

Published by the American Tract Society, Boston.

This work is just published, and contains all the astronomical and other useful matter embraced in the common Almanacs together with a rich fund of religious instruction, various items of reference adapted to general convenience and utility, and a view of the progress of the Cause of Benevolence throughout the world. To encourage the circulation, the Committee have fixed the prices at the lowest possible rates; considering the good it will accomplish more important than any profit which could be derived from the sales. It comprises 36 pages, neatly done up in printed covers; and is sold at 6 1-4 cents single; 50 cents per dozen; \$3.50 per hundred.

The Committee hope this little work will be extensively circulated, as much pains has been taken to fill its pages with information which every family should possess. They would earnestly invite Clergymen and Merchants to use all due influence to introduce it to every family. Auxiliary Tract Societies may do much to circulate it. One Clergyman has recommended that every member of the Tract Society in his Parish should obtain a copy, as a part of the amount of their subscription. If this suggestion should be regarded generally, and every member of every Auxiliary Tract Society obtain a copy, they would avail themselves of much important information respecting the various Benevolent Societies in our country, which many would not otherwise obtain.

Orders for the Christian Almanac should be directed to LINCOLN & EDMANDS, Boston, or to Mr. AARON RUSSELL, Hanover Church, Boston.



The following Notice of the Almanac is from the Vermont Chronicle.

This is the eighth number of the Christian Almanac, and is certainly not inferior in merit to those that have preceded it.—Many reasons might be given why this Almanac should be preferred to any other that we are acquainted with—such as.

1. It is a better looking pamphlet—being handsomely printed on good paper, and very neatly trimmed and done up in a colored and printed cover.
2. It is cheaper—the price being only 6 1-4 cents single, 50 cents per dozen, and \$3.50 per hundred.
3. Its contents are more valuable. The Calendar pages, &c. have been carefully prepared and are sufficiently full, and the remainder of the pamphlet—more than 20 pages—is filled with matter of much value and interest to the farmer and the Christian. The notices of Benevolent Societies, for instance, are worth much more than the cost of the pamphlet, were it only that one might have always at hand for occasional reference, a concise and accurate view of their objects, history and resources.
4. Its contents are such as will tend, not to corrupt the principles and taste of its readers, but the contrary, and therefore it ought by all means to be preferred where there are children and youth to handle “the Almanac.”
5. It is fitted to contribute something, wherever it is read, towards the prevalence of truly Christian principles, feelings, and conduct—of holiness, peace, love—of enlightened piety and active benevolence.
6. The profits of this Almanac go to increase the funds of the American Tract Society, upon which there are urgent calls from distant regions of the globe, as well as from different parts of our own land.

Much more might be said; but the above reasons would seem sufficient to induce every Christian to introduce this Almanac into his family, in preference to any other; and every one who is in the habit of retailing Almanacs, to use his influence to promote its circulation.

